

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 19 through 21 are pending, with Claims 19 and 21 being independent. Claims 19 and 21 have been amended. The Examiner's attention is directed, by way of example and not of limitation, to pp. 27-29.

Claims 1 and 3 through 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 7,302,696 B1 (Yamamoto) in view of US 5,909,673 (Gregory), US 2003/0101451 A1 (Bentolila, et al.), WO 01/65852 A1 (the Official Action refers to US2003/0023968 A1 (Nishi, et al.) for citations), US 5,285,278 (Holman), and newly-cited US 2008/0098291 A1 (Bradley, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 21 recite, *inter alia*, rewriting a property value relating to sub-print content in the print content to a property value relating to the selected sub-print content when the sub-print content includes an image, and alternatively rewrites the property value or text data between tags in the mark-up language to a property value or text data each relating to the selected sub-print content when the sub-print content includes only text.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the applied documents, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed feature as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 19 and 21.

The Official Action states that Yamamoto lacks sub-print content, and relies, for example, upon (a) WO '852 for showing, e.g., that the coupon discount rate varies based on the display state history information, (b) Bentolila, et al. for showing the time when a user started

watching a program, (c) Gregory for showing a site specific coupon using a template and modifying the template with specific information, and (d) Bradley, et al. for showing XML given Gregory's deficiencies. Applicants respectfully traverse such reliance. Applicants submit that even if, *arguendo*, Bradley, et al.'s XML could somehow be combined with Gregory's templates, that the proposed combination of all of the documents would still be silent at least as regards the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 19 and 21.

Applicants further respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG:rjlr

FCHS_WS 4262343v1